

**MEETING OF THE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS**

**2535 Capitol Oaks Drive
Third Floor Conference Room
Sacramento, California, 95833
(916) 263-2222**

Thursday, January 15, 2009, beginning at 1:00 p.m.

Board Members Present: Patrick Tami, President; Kim Blackseth, Vice President; James Foley; David Luzuriaga; Mike Modugno; Ray Satorre; and Michael Trujillo

Board Members Absent: Gregg Brandow and Jerry Silva

Board Staff Present: Cindi Christenson (Executive Officer); Nancy Eissler (Enforcement Program Manager); Cindy Fernandez (Executive Analyst); Debbie Thompson (Budget Analyst); Joanne Arnold (Assistant Executive Officer); Tiffany Criswell (Enforcement Analyst); Julie Baker (Enforcement Analyst); Tralee Carney (Enforcement Analyst); Donna Vaum (Enforcement Analyst); Don Chang (Legal Counsel); and Linda Brown (Administration Manager)

1. Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

The meeting was called to order by President Tami at 1:15 p.m. Roll call was taken, and there was a quorum.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. Consideration of Geotechnical Engineering Examination Format (Possible Action)

Ms. Christ reported that the Geotechnical Engineer Examination (GEE) is an 8-hour exam currently administered once a year in October. The examination is a combination of multiple-choice and essay items.

Ms. Christ reported that the examination vendor has recommended that this exam be converted to an entirely multiple choice exam, and to eliminate all essay questions. The exam format would still be four hours in the morning and four in the afternoon, with both sections typically consisting of 85 multiple-choice items.

The psychometric staff at Prometric, Inc, the GEE vendor for the Board, asserts that a multiple choice (M/C) format will provide increased coverage of all content areas in the examination test plan, and therefore will improve the psychometric soundness of the exam. By using design/essay questions, the problem dictates what elements can be included. Making each multiple-choice item a stand alone problem permits independent measurement of content, as opposed to dependencies that exist with design/essay questions. An entirely M/C GEE will be machine scored, eliminating the subjectivity and exorbitant cost of human scoring as well.

Ms. Christ stated that the conversion of the GEE to an entirely M/C exam format would improve the psychometric soundness of the exam at a cost savings of \$100,000 to the Board.

MOTION: Mr. Foley/Mr. Luzuriaga moved to convert the Geotechnical Engineering Examination to an entirely multiple choice format exam.

VOTE: 7-0. motion carried.

4. Governor's Press Release Indicating the Need to Increase the Number of Engineers by 20,000, including but not limited to, Early Admission Process to the Professional Engineers and Professional Land Surveyors Examinations (Possible Action)

a. Panel Discussion regarding the Early Admission Process to the Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Examinations

This panel discussion will be held on Friday, January 16, 2009, beginning at 9:00 a.m. The panel will discuss the benefits and challenges of the Early Admission Process. The Board welcomes public participation during the panel discussion.

President Tami reported that this item would be held on Friday, January 16, 2009.

5. Approval of Delinquent Reinstatements (Possible Action)

MOTION: Mr. Foley/Mr. Satorre moved to approve the Delinquent Reinstatements in the agenda as follows:

CIVIL

DOUGLAS BUZBEE

Reinstate applicant's civil license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

INDUSTRIAL

PHUONG-TRAM PATRICIA MA

Reinstate applicant's industrial license once he/she takes and passes the Board's Laws and Regulations Examination and pays all delinquent and renewal fees.

VOTE: 7-0, motion carried.

6. Comity and Temporary Authorization Applications (Possible Action)

MOTION: Vice President Blackseth/Mr. Foley moved to approve the Handout Comity List.

VOTE: 7-0, motion carried.

7. Administration

a. Fund Condition

Ms. Thompson gave an update on revenue projections included in the fund condition for FY 2008-09 using revenue received up to November 30, 2008. Exam application revenue projections reduced from \$3,924,000 to \$3,865,000. License renewal revenue projections increased from \$5,192,000 to \$5,228,000. The change amounts to an overall decrease in projected revenue of \$23,000. This FY's decline in license renewal revenue is consistent with the historical revenue trend whereby revenue drops by up to 20% for one out of the two years in the renewal cycle. Mr. Modugno questioned if the revenue projections include licensees that drop out. Ms. Thompson indicated that the revenue includes new licensees and those that drop out or apply for a retired status.

b. Fiscal Year 2008-09 Budgets

1) Expenditure Reductions Alternatives, including but not limited to, Not Offering Some Examinations in April 2009 and Enforcement Program Cuts

Expense reports through November 30, 2008 show a total expense of \$9,474,108 leaving a projected year-end deficit balance of \$62,024. This is a correction to the \$119,117 expense reported in the Board long agenda. The deficit is a result of the unexpected \$107,000 proctor separation payout of benefits required by the Governor's Executive Order #S-09-08. Ms. Thompson explained that additional funds are set aside for an exam population increase in April 2009 estimated to be approximately 6%. Historically, the Board's exam population increases each FY resulting in an increase in the Board's national exam grading expense.

Ms. Thompson reported that Board staff met with DCA staff December 5, 2008 to discuss the Board's projected deficit and the Board's vote to cancel an April exam to reduce expenses. DCA indicated they would work closely with Board staff to eliminate the deficit and that cancellation of an exam would not be needed. President Tami questioned if the projections included the 2-day state employee work furlough effective February 6, 2009. Ms. Thompson reported that the furlough would generate an added \$15,000 monthly savings plus a possible reduction not yet known for the salary-related prorata expense the Board pays to DCA. Such a savings would likely eliminate the Board's current deficit. Ms. Thompson pointed out that the ongoing yearly exam administration cost increases for exam population growth will be funded completely by NCEES once they begin administering the Board's exams.

c. Land Surveyor Position Redirection

The FY 2008-09 Budget Change Proposal was approved to redirect the Board's operating and expense contract budget authority (now used to fund a Land Surveyor Contract) to personal services to establish the Land Surveyor position effective January 1, 2009. The Senior Engineer Registrar (SER) classification specification amendments are still pending State Personnel Board approval needed to conduct an exam and hire a Land Surveyor into the new Board Registrar position. The SER classification currently allows only a California licensed engineer to be hired and doesn't include requirements for a California licensed land surveyor. The Board is now providing responses to additional routine questions brought up by DPA. The existing Land Surveyor consultant contract will be amended several months beyond its March 31, 2009 expiration date to ensure the workload is completed until such time an individual can be hired into the newly approved classification.

d. Publication Review

Ms. Eissler reported that Enforcement staff is finalizing the Technical Expert Manual and the Guide for Local Building Officials is still being updated incorporating comments from President Tami and Dr. Brandow. The publications must then go through an approval process at DCA prior to printing. Ms. Eissler expects to have the DCA Office of Publications assist with the formatting and printing of these publications. Ms. Eissler hopes these publications will be available by late April 2009.

e. NCEES Exam Fee Pass Through and Exam Administration

Ms. Thompson reported on the three feasible fee structure alternatives to be included in the Board's regulations required before NCEES can begin administering the Board's exams. The new fee structure is required because Board qualified applicants will pay their national and state exam

testing fee, national exam booklet and national exam grading fees directly to NCEES. The Board will receive from applicants an application processing fee and a state-specific exam fee for those taking state exams. As each alternative requires revenue to decrease by the same amount as the expense decreases, the license renewal fee will decrease. Ms. Thompson reviewed the cost to become licensed impact to exam applicants of each alternative. Alternative #3 provides a fee structure with the least cost increase impact overall to applicants seeking licensure.

MOTION: Mr. Foley/Vice President Blackseth moved to approve Alternative#3 for inclusion in the Board's regulations.

VOTE: 7-0, motion carried.

f. Four Year Renewal vs. Two Year Renewal (Possible Action)

Ms. Thompson reported that there has been a request to change the July 1, 2003 instituted 4-year license renewal back to a 2-year renewal. The goal behind this 2003 change was a reduction in the number of delinquent renewal requests processed by the Board. During the last three years, there has been a 27% reduction in the number of delinquent license renewals processed. Also, NCEES statistics show 2-year license renewals are required by nearly all other state engineering boards. Two-year renewals are also required by other professions licensed under DCA.

The Board's financial stability requires a revenue consistency. Therefore, the issue of how to more evenly distribute the renewal cycles during would need to be addressed to reduce the revenue gaps such a change would create.

Mr. DeWitt representing ACEC, distributed copies of ACEC's position. Mr. DeWitt reported that the 4-year license renewal is needed because license expirations occur before projects are completed. When this happens, the project engineering plans must be resealed and re-signed. As projects are now taking much longer than in the past, this added work is very time consuming. ACEC is seeking Board support but may propose legislation without Board support.

Mr. Foley stated that the post office will forward mail for a year and possibly two. Licensees who forget to submit a change of address could face re-taking their exam to re-instate their license. Another benefit, Mr. Foley stated was the Board's revenue flow which is now more consistent from year to year with a 2-year licensing period. Pre-1988 CE's must take Seismic and Surveying portion of their exam. Mr. Foley pointed out that legislation to lengthen the 2-year renewal may not be the appropriate avenue to address ACEC's concerns. A building can still be built when the responsible charge engineer's license expires as long as

the license is kept current even though the plan stamps are expired. All the design and build DCA Board's including architect's Board require a 2-year license.

President Tami expressed support for the 4-year renewal indicating that he recently had to stamp over 100 legal descriptions because his Land Surveyor license expired prior to submitting his plans for approval. Although his stamp and signing was electronic, it was still very time consuming.

Mr. Foley suggested that the date be deleted from the seal. The Nevada Board does not require a date with the seal for licensees. The expiration date requirement was initiated in the 1980's and there may not be a need for it now.

Mr. Luzuriaga expressed his support for elimination of the seal date indicating that, in his professional practice experiences, the seal date is required only for city approval.

Ms. Eissler reported that the license expiration date inclusion on building permits is required by statute. An exclusion of the date on the stamp would require a Board regulatory change, but exclusion of the date on engineering and land surveying documents would require statutory changes.

MOTION: Mr. Foley/Mr. Luzuriaga moved to maintain a 2-year license renewal.

VOTE: 7-0, motion carried.

The Board directed that the expiration date requirement will be included on the agenda for further discussion at the next Board meeting.

8. Enforcement (Possible Action)

Ms. Eissler introduced Enforcement Analysts Julie Baker, Tralee Carney, Tiffany Criswell, and Donna Vaum, who were in attendance at the meeting.

Ms. Eissler reviewed the Enforcement statistics presented in the agenda packet. She reported that so far for the month of January, 13 cases had been opened and 27 closed.

President Tami thanked the Enforcement Unit for their hard work getting the older cases closed.

9. Legislative

a. Discussion of Proposed Legislation for 2009 (Possible Action)

Ms. Arnold reported that the language that the Board submitted last year to the Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development (that was included in SB 1779 and subsequently vetoed by the Governor) will be included in one of this year's Committee omnibus bills.

Ms. Arnold also reported that proposed language to give the Board fingerprint authority has been submitted to the Department of Consumer Affairs legislative unit to be included in a bill by DCA which would allow numerous boards and bureaus to start fingerprinting applicants and licenses. Fingerprinting would give us access to criminal records. The Department is still considering this issue.

b. Regulation Status Report

Ms. Eissler gave an update on the Regulations contained in the agenda. Notices should be sent out by Mid February 2009.

10. Technical Advisory Committee TAC Reports

a. Board Assignments to TACs (Possible Action)

There were no Board assignments.

b. Appointment of TAC Members (Possible Action)

Ms. Christenson introduced Mr. Phil Ball, member of the METAC.

11. Liaison Reports (Possible Action)

a. ABET

No ABET report was given.

b. NCEES

1. Nomination for Western Zone & National Awards

It was recommended to nominate Mr. Foley and Dr. Brandow for Western Zone and National Awards for all their contributions.

2. Appointment of Emeritus Members

MOTION: Mr. Foley/Mr. Trujillo moved to retain Mr. Ted Fairfield as an Emeritus Board Member.

VOTE: 7-0, motion carried.

c. Technical and Professional Societies

Mr. Foley reported that he will be attending a NCEES Finance meeting March 1, 2009 in Tampa.

12. President's Report

President Tami reported that he has been working with the Land Surveyor Exam committee with the field testing.

President Tami would like to see Mr. Moore and Ms. Christ cross train so they can see how the other's field testing works.

13. Executive Officer's Report

1. Administration Report

a. Executive Summary Report

Information contained in the agenda.

2. Personnel

a. New Hires

Ms. Christenson reported that there have been no "new" hires, but that we have moved around people in the office. Glenda Mathews retired, and Vicki Kereszt was moved into her position as the new Business Services Officer and Julie Ayres, the receptionist, has been moved into cashiering.

b. Vacancies

Ms. Christenson reported that there is a vacancy for a receptionist and an Exam Development Coordinator.

3. Enforcement/Examination/Licensing

c. College Outreach

Ms. Christenson reported that there has been no College Outreach due to winter break at schools.

d. Report on Examination Activities – April Exam

Ms. Christenson reported that the April 2009 EIT exam will again be held at Cal Poly – San Luis Obispo for Cal Poly students.

4. Publications/Website

a. Website Activity Statistics

The information was contained in the agenda.

5. Other –

a. DCA Update

Ms. Christenson reported that the work furlough is suppose to begin February 6, 2009, with all State employees required to take the first and third Friday off each month because State offices will be closed.

Ms. Christenson reported that DCA Director, Carrie Lopez, has proposed that between the “Big Summit” meetings that the Boards and Bureaus hold “Mini Summit” meetings geared more towards their individual issues.

14. Other Items Not Requiring Board Action

Date of Next Board Meeting: April 16 & 17, 2009, Location To Be Determined

Ms. Christenson reported that the April 2009 meeting will be held at the Mission Inn Riverside pending contract approval.

Mr. Luzuriaga requested that discussion on Profession Engineer Reference Forms be included as an agenda item at a future Board meeting.

Ms. Eissler reported that at the April 2009 Board meeting, there may be Regulation Hearings and Petition Hearings for Reinstatement of Revoked Licenses.

15. Closed Session – Personnel Matters, Examination Procedures and Results, Administrative Adjudication, and Pending Litigation (As Needed) [Pursuant to Government Code sections 11126(a) and (b), 11126(c)(1), 11126(c)(3), 11126 (e)(1), and 11126(e)(2)(B)(i)]

- a. **Michael William Foster v. Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, Court of Appeal Third Appellate District Case No. C050630 (El Dorado Superior Court Case No. PC 20030492)**
- b. **Discrimination Complaint (Authority for Closed Session Discussion pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e)(2)(B)(i))**

16. Open Session to Announce the Results of Closed Session

Ms. Christenson reported that the Board discussed pending litigation as noticed, specifically: Michael William Foster v. Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, Court of Appeal Third Appellate District Case No. C050630 (El Dorado Superior Court Case No. PC 20030492); and the Discrimination Complaint (Authority for Closed Session Discussion pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e)(2)(B)(i))

Ms. Christenson reported that the Board adopted the results of the take-home examination for the candidates who had previously passed the 8-hour portion of the examinations.

Ms. Christenson reported that the Board approved the following cut scores for the October 2008 examinations:

- EIT Pass/Fail Only

•	LSIT	Pass/Fail Only
•	Agricultural	Pass/Fail Only
•	Chemical	Pass/Fail Only
•	Control System	Pass/Fail Only
•	Electrical	Pass/Fail Only
•	Fire Protection	Pass/Fail Only
•	Industrial	Pass/Fail Only
•	Mechanical	Pass/Fail Only
•	Metallurgical	Pass/Fail Only
•	Nuclear	Pass/Fail Only
•	Petroleum	Pass/Fail Only
•	Traffic	score of 78 out of 120
•	Civil 8-hour	Pass/Fail Only
•	Seismic Principles	score of 151 out of 285
•	Engineering Surveying	score of 183 out of 294
•	Structural National	Pass/Fail Only
•	Structural State	score of 170 out of 400
•	Geotechnical	score of 433 out of 900
•	Land Surveyor National	Pass/Fail Only

17. Approval of Consent Items (Possible Action)

(These items are before the Board for consent and will be approved with a single motion following the completion of Closed Session. Any item that a Board member wishes to discuss will be removed from the consent items and considered separately.)

a. **Approval of the Minutes of the November 20, 2008, Board Meeting**

b. **Approval of Candidates for Certification/Licensure (Based on Examination Results, Including Successful Appeals, Adopted in Closed Session)**

MOTION: Mr. Foley/Mr. Luzuriaga moved to approve the consent items.

VOTE: 7-0, motion carried

18. Adjourn

The Board adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Friday, January 16, 2009, beginning at 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present: Patrick Tami, President; James Foley; David Luzuriaga; Mike Modugno; Ray Satorre; and Michael Trujillo

Board Members Absent: Kim Blackseth, Vice President; Gregg Brandow; and Jerry Silva

Board Staff Present: Cindi Christenson (Executive Officer); Nancy Eissler (Enforcement Program Manager); Cindy Fernandez (Executive Analyst); Debbie Thompson (Budget Analyst); Joanne Arnold (Assistant Executive Officer); Julie Baker (Enforcement Analyst); Donna Vaum (Enforcement Analyst); Don Chang (Legal Counsel); and Linda Brown (Administration Manager)

1. Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

The meeting was called to order by President Tami at 9:05 a.m. Roll call was taken, and there was not a quorum.

Mr. Trujillo arrived at 9:15 a.m.

4. Governor's Press Release Indicating the Need to Increase the Number of Engineers by 20,000, including but not limited to, Early Admission Process to the Professional Engineers and Professional Land Surveyors Examinations (Possible Action)

a. Panel Discussion regarding the Early Admission Process to the Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Examinations

This panel discussion will be held on Friday, January 16, 2009, beginning at 9:00 a.m. The panel will discuss the benefits and challenges of the Early Admission Process. The Board welcomes public participation during the panel discussion.

President Tami had the panel introduce themselves. The panel consisted of James Orr, CE, PECG; Bob DeWitt, CE, ACEC; Patty Mamola, CE, Chair, Nevada Board Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors; Donnie Gallagher, RBF Consulting; Mike Modugno, PE, Board Member; Pat Tami, PLS, Board President; Jim Foley, PE, Board Member; Ray Satorre, Public Board Member; David Luzuriaga, PE, Board Member; and Spencer Walker, Senior Advisor to the Director of DCA.

President Tami thanked everyone for attending and stated that they would be discussing the Early Admission Process (EAP) which has been implemented in Nevada and New Mexico.

Ms. Mamola explained how the Nevada Board implemented the EAP program in 2005. She stated that it required they go to legislature and make a change in state laws. The justification for doing this was to encourage licensure of engineers. She also stated that there has been debate over the years whether the examination is academia-based or practice-based and that a sub-reason for doing this was to gather data to substantiate one way or the other which it is.

Ms. Mamola reported that after approval, the application process basically stayed the same with the exception that applicants are not required to submit references at the time of the initial application. She emphasized the fact that even though candidates are allowed to take the examination anytime after graduation, they still have to wait four years to become licensed; they must get experience before becoming licensed. Upon gaining the requisite experience an application for licensure, which includes references, is submitted.

Mr. Dewitt asked Ms. Mamola if she had any statistics in regards to the EAP.

Ms. Mamola reported that they track civil engineering applicants only; in the last six examination cycles where the candidates took the exam right after graduation, those candidate has a higher pass rate in four of the six exam cycles; the other two were not much lower. Ms. Mamola also reported that in the first two years, the number of applications doubled.

Ms. Christenson asked Ms. Mamola if they have seen an increase in disciplines other than civil engineering. Ms. Mamola reported that she did not have those statistics.

President Tami asked Ms. Mamola if there were any hurdles or obstacles that the Nevada Board had to overcome.

Ms. Mamola stated that the biggest hurdle/obstacle was the Legislature and that was not too bad. She stated that it was an easy sell because it should increase licensure if one catches the applicant right out of school.

Ms. Mamola stated that NCEES was an obstacle at first because they are concerned with giving a practice-based exam to individuals who have not practiced. However, they seem to be warming up to the idea because a few other states have also implemented the EAP.

President Tami asked Ms. Mamola if there was anything they would have done differently. Ms. Mamola replied that they would not do anything differently and that the process is working very well.

Mr. Orr asked Ms. Mamola when the EIT examination was taken. Ms. Mamola responded that the EIT examination is required to be taken while in college, but they are not required to pass it.

Mr. Foley asked if it is published when the candidate passes the NCEES examination. Ms. Mamola stated that it is not published on the website, but someone could call the office to find out if someone passed and they would be given the information. Ms. Mamola believes that if the candidate passes the examination, it could be used as a marketing tool for getting a job.

Ms. Christenson asked Ms. Mamola if they have had anyone challenge them to grant them a license because they have passed the examinations. Ms. Mamola indicated that there have been no such challenges to the best of her knowledge.

Mr. Modugno stated that to be able to take the examination early would be a tremendous advantage. Candidates oftentimes have family obligations when they are studying for the examination under the current situation and to be able to eliminate the additional stress by being able to take it right after school would be beneficial to candidates and the employer.

President Tami asked the panel if they saw any benefits to the EAP.

Mr. Orr reported that this was discussed at PECG's December meeting and that it is a pretty new idea. The most attractive aspect is that it would be encouraging more people to become licensed. He believes the sooner one takes it right out of school, the better prepared one is. Mr. Orr reported that PECG was pretty evenly divided on the EAP, but if they took a position right now, it would probably be against implementing the EAP. Mr. Orr indicated that one of the concerns was that it may give a person a false sense of confidence and perhaps instill a false sense of confidence into the organization which could lead individuals to be placed into positions that they are not ready for.

Mr. Orr expressed another concern about supervisors and lead engineers in regards to being asked to be a reference. If the EAP is implemented, the supervisor/lead engineer may feel pressured into giving a recommendation/reference to the candidate because the candidate has passed the examination.

Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Luzuriaga indicated that the EAP may strengthen the supervisor/lead engineer position and hold them more accountable. For instance, currently, many references who might provide a negative reference or who are on the fence about a particular individual give a positive reference and "let the exam weed them out."

Mr. Foley stated that he believes it is up to licensed engineers as professionals to determine whether to give a recommendation/reference or not, and, if they give one when they should not, then they are not doing their jobs.

President Tami asked how to help the supervisor/lead engineer who believes the pressure of having to give a recommendation/reference to that candidate who passed their examination.

Mr. Gallagher indicated that candidates do not see what a reference indicates so supervisors should be more honest.

President Tami explained that if the candidate submits the minimum number of recommendation/references and one or more is not positive, the candidate will be contacted and told that not all of the recommendations/references were positive and that they need to submit more. However, the candidate is not advised as to which reference was not positive.

Mr. Orr stated that he personally believes that evaluating engineers is a very hard job because a great deal of it is very subjective. He believes that if a person is asked to be a reference and they know that they are going to give the candidate a “bad” recommendation/reference, they should decline as a matter of ethics.

Mr. DeWitt reported that ACEC discussed this item at their October meeting. ACEC’s discussion was along the lines of PECG’s. ACEC opposes implementing the EAP because they do not think it will advance the profession, and they think the present way works fine. They believe it is important for the candidate to accumulate the necessary experience in order to take the examination. If the examination is more academically-based rather than practice-based, then it throws a whole different kind of light on the subject.

President Tami asked Mr. DeWitt if ACEC saw any kind of benefit in implementing the EAP. Mr. DeWitt replied that no one spoke of any.

Mr. DeWitt did indicate, however, that increasing the pool of professional engineers is certainly a desirable goal for all aspects.

President Tami asked Mr. DeWitt if it would change ACEC’s opinion at all if additional experience beyond the current two years of work experience after graduation was required. Mr. DeWitt responded that may factor into the discussion.

Mr. Gallagher reported that he graduated early and believed that his experience would count up to the actual exam date. However, when he was filling out the application, he realized he did not have the experience because the experience had to be gained by the final filing date. He believes the EAP process would assist individuals that are in similar situations as his.

Mr. Hofferber stated that CLSA is neutral on this item but would like to see the implementation of the Log Book with this item because of the responsibility of references and experience being the last hurdle of licensure. He explained that a candidate would use the Log Book during the time he or she is gaining experience and the experience would be signed off on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Hofferber asked Ms. Mamola if Nevada had any statistics on if there has been an increase of unlicensed activity. Ms. Mamola stated that they have no statistics, but she had not heard any reports of an increase.

Mr. Hofferber believes that by implementing the EAP it may cause an increase in land surveyors obtaining college degrees because they could take the examination right out of school.

Mr. DeWitt stated that he believes that the land surveyor examination is a more practice-based examination than the professional engineering examinations.

President Tami asked Mr. Gallagher how he thought other students would think the EAP.

Mr. Gallagher responded that he thinks that students who interned while in college would probably take the test right after graduation, but the students who did not intern while in college would probably wait.

Mr. Gallagher stated that he did not even know what an EIT/PE was until he started as an intern. Mr. Gallagher believes that if the EAP was implemented, it would be a benefit because licensure would be discussed more and the professors would talk about it in class which would bring about more students realizing that it would be a benefit. Mr. Gallagher believes that if the examination were offered right after graduation, it would be a benefit because the candidate would still be in the mind set of studying and learning and the pass rate would probably be higher; whereas if they had to wait, they will forget things and be out of the habit of studying.

President Tami asked the panel what they thought of continuing education.

Mr. DeWitt personally believes that it is a good thing, but ACEC has not really discussed the matter.

Mr. Orr stated that PEGC has an official position that right now it is against continuing education, but, personally, Mr. Orr believes it is a good thing.

Ms. Mamola stated that Nevada has continuing education requirements and that the Nevada Board randomly checks the companies that offer continuing education to make sure that they are legitimate.

Mr. DeWitt stated that ACEC has a strong program of seminars and classes that is directed to technical areas and that many of their members take advantage of these seminars and classes.

Mr. Modugno asked if it would help mitigate the concerns with EAP if another year of experience were added as a requirement. It was indicated by some individuals that they would have to pose this question to their membership.

Ms. Christenson stated that, at the administrative level, with the process as it currently is, it requires quite a bit of work and extra staff to complete the evaluation process. However, if we were to change it to the EAP, the engineering staff would be able to perform a more thorough review because only those individuals who have passed the exam and gained the experience would be submitting the experience and reference portion of the application.

President Tami asked Ms. Christenson to explain the current review process.

Ms. Christenson indicated that California has a large volume of applicants and the majority of them submit the application on or a few days before the final filing date. Prior to technical review by the engineers and land surveyor, all applications must be cashiered, input into the computerized database, and have a file made for each candidate.

She also discussed the timeframes of having to provide exam counts to the NCEES. These are problematic again due our large population and because NCEES is not use to working with a state that has the examination population that California has. NCEES wants counts regarding the number of examination books that will be needed for each examination cycle, and, because of our final filling dates, we cannot have an accurate count to NCEES in time. Therefore, each examination cycle, we estimate the number of exams needed based on past examination cycles.

President Tami stated that there may be a cost savings by implementing the EAP as we would be able to get a more accurate count and not have to estimate the number of examination books/materials needed for each examination cycle.

Mr. Foley also reported that the Board intends to contract with ELSEES to administer our exams in the future due to the liability should we lose an exam. For instance, if one complete examination of all the disciplines is compromised, it is between six to seven million dollars to replace those items, and NCEES will look to that state to recover the cost. Mr. Foley stated that NCEES has looked into getting insurance for this, but there is none. Therefore, NCEES is setting aside a certain dollar amount for self-insurance.

Mr. Gallagher asked if allowing the EAP would shorten the amount of time required to process the applications.

Ms. Christenson responded that it would because we would only be looking at two things: 1) does the applicant have an EIT and 2) does the applicant have an accredited degree.

Mr. Orr asked if there was a minimum time required between the EIT and PE.

Ms. Christenson stated that if they meet the criteria, they can take one right after the other.

Mr. DeWitt asked if DCA had any input on the EAP. Mr. Walker responded that at this point DCA is neutral and that they are reviewing the process.

Mr. Foley stated that other professions, such as accountants, lawyers and architects, can take their examination right after graduation.

Mr. DeWitt expressed another concern which is the current examination dates in April and October. He inquired as to whether it is possible to have a change there.

Mr. Foley stated that this may be a good project for ACEC to take on with NCEES.

Mr. Orr indicated that the Log Book is a good idea; an applicant can build his portfolio and then submit the portfolio when he is ready to be licensed.

Ms. Mamola stated that the Nevada Board has had nothing but good experiences with the EAP and they have had no downside. Ms. Mamola did want to clarify again that the NCEES professional examination is a practice-based examination. She believes that the EAP is a good thing for the profession and that, as a state board, it is their responsibility to encourage licensure so that there will be more engineers and land surveyors.

President Tami stated that what prompted this proposal is that the Governor issued a press release indicating the need to increase the number of licensed engineers by 20,000.

Mr. Foley stated that he has tried to track down where this number of 20,000 engineers came from and has been unable to contact anyone who can verify this number.

Mr. Satorre believes in the EAP but also believes that if something is not broken it, it does not need to be fixed.

Mr. Gallagher reported that he recently went to a career fair and that there are currently more engineers than there are jobs available and that everyone is desperate for work.

Mr. Modugno stated that right now the environment is not very good for engineers, but we need to look at the overall long term picture and the more qualified people we can get into the profession, the better off we will be.

President Tami thanked everyone for being part of the panel discussion.

Ms. Christenson reported that the next step would be for the Board to review and consider the comments from the panel discussion today because some items have not been discussed by the Board. The Board would need to pursue legislation to implement the EAP.

Mr. Foley asked if PECG and ACEC could firm up their positions on this and make a presentation to the Board with their pro's and con's.

A request was made to have a written summary of the panel discussion available so that organizations could use it for discussion. Board staff indicated that they could have a draft available by the end of January.

18. Adjourn

The Board adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

PUBLIC PRESENT

Bob DeWitt, ACEC-CA

Bill Hofferber, CLSA

Phil Ball, METAC

Monroe Cash, DCA

Steve Hao, Cal Trans